

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending with claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 23, and 29 being independent.

Claims 1, 6, 17, and 23 have been amended.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 22 and 30 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 12 and dependent claims 3-5, 7, 9-11, 13-14, and 16 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Sendova (U.S. Patent No. 6,132,053) in view of Fukiharu (U.S. Patent No. 6,435,687).

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite "a light guide plate having an upper surface for emitting a light, a first side surface and a second side surface, wherein the upper surface is perpendicular to the first side surface and to the second side surface" and "a point light source facing an intersection of said first side surface and said second side surface." Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 8.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 and their dependent claims because neither Sendova, Fukiharu, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests the recited point light source.

In Sendova, light source 21 is adjacent to either light input edge 302a or 302b of light guide 300, which the Examiner equates to the claimed light guide plate (Figs. 1, 6, 8, or 9 of Sendova). Accordingly, light source 21 does not face an intersection of a first side surface and a second side surface that are each perpendicular to an upper light emitting surface of light guide 300.

Fukiharu does not overcome the deficiencies of Sendova. In Fukiharu, light source 16, which the Examiner equates to the point light source, is adjacent to either edge 12a or edge 12b of light guide 12 (Fig. 1 of Fukiharu), and therefore, light source 16 does not face an intersection of a first side surface and a second side surface that are each perpendicular to an upper light emitting surface of a light guide plate.

For at least these reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6, and the claims that depend from them.

Claim 12 recites "a light guiding plate having a first side surface, a second side surface, and a third side surface, wherein said first side surface is not perpendicular to said second side

NOT AVAILABLE CO.

surface and said third side surface ... and light emitted from said point light source is incident on said first side surface.” Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 and its dependent claims because neither Sendova, Fukiharu, nor or any combination of the two, describes or suggests the recited light guiding plate.

The Examiner states that Sendova discloses “a light guiding plate 300 having a first side surface (28), a second side surface (12), and a third side surface (26); wherein the first side surface is not perpendicular to the second side surface and the third side surface.” Contrary to the Examiner’s contention, the reflector 28, the LCD display 12, and the reflector 26, which the Examiner equates to the side surfaces of the claimed light guiding plate, are not side surfaces of light guide 300, which the Examiner equates to the claimed light guiding plate. Rather, the reflector 28, the LCD display 12, and the reflector 26 are other elements of the flat panel display assembly of Fig. 1 of Sendova and, accordingly, are separate and distinct from the light guide 300. As shown in Figs. 3 and 6 of Sendova, the light guide 300 does not have the recited side surfaces. Instead, the light guide 300 has side surfaces that are perpendicular to each other.

Fukiharu does not overcome the deficiencies in Sendova. In particular, Fukiharu does not describe or suggest at least the claimed light guiding plate. For at least these reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12, and the claims that depend from it.

Independent claims 17, 21, and 23 and dependent claims 18, 24, 27, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maegawa (U.S. Patent No. 4,954,930) in view of Fukiharu.

Claims 17 and 23 have been amended to recite “a second light guiding plate ... not in contact with said first light guiding plate.” Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 23 and their dependent claims because neither Maegawa, Fukiharu, nor or any combination of the two, describes or suggests the recited second light guiding plate.

In Maegawa, the illuminating portion 2a of light guide 1, which the Examiner equates to the second light guiding plate, is in contact with the light receiving portion 4 of light guide 1, which the Examiner equates to the first light guiding plate (Fig. 2 of Maegawa). Fukiharu does not overcome the deficiencies of Maegawa. In particular, light guides 2, 12, and 22 do not include the recited second light guiding plate.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Claim 21 recites "a first light guiding plate ... wherein said first light guiding plate has a larger refractive index than said second light guiding plate" (emphasis added). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 and its dependent claims because neither Maegawa, Fukiharu, nor or any combination of the two, describes or suggests the recited first light guiding plate.

For at least these reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17, 21, and 23, and the claims that depend from them.

Independent claim 29 and dependent claims 30-32 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Hoshi (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,944) in view of Fukiharu.

Claim 29 relates to a liquid crystal display device including a first light guiding plate and a second light guiding plate. Neither Hoshi nor Fukiharu, either alone or in combination, disclose the claimed liquid crystal display device. The Examiner states that "Hoshi discloses an illumination device and LCD apparatus including ... a first light guiding plate (21) ... a second light guiding plate (31)." The Examiner, however, is equating light guide member 21 of the first embodiment of the invention in Hoshi (Fig. 3 of Hoshi, col. 7, line 39 to col.10, line 44) with the claimed first light guiding plate and is equating light guide member 31 of the second embodiment of the invention of Hoshi (Fig. 6 of Hoshi, col. 10, line 45 to col. 12, line 31) with the claimed second light guiding plate. The light guide member 21 and the light guide member 31 are, therefore, parts of two separate and independent embodiments and are, therefore, not described as being present together in any single device or apparatus in Hoshi. Accordingly, Hoshi does not disclose a liquid crystal display device having both a first light guiding plate and a second light guiding plate. Fukiharu does not overcome the deficiencies of Hoshi. In particular, light guides 2, 12, and 22 do not include the recited second light guiding plate.

For at least these reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29, and the claims that depend from it.

Dependent claims 2, 8, and 15, which depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 12, respectively, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sendova in view of Fukiharu and further in view of Hoshi. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 6, and 12, neither Sendora, Fukiharu, nor any combination of the two,

NOT AVAILABLE

describes or suggests the point light source recited in claims 1 and 6 and the light guiding plate recited in claim 12.

Hoshi does not overcome the deficiencies of Sendova and Fukiharu. In particular, Hoshi does not describe or suggest the point light source recited in claims 1 and 6 and the light guiding plate recited in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 8, and 15.

Dependent claims 19 and 20, which depend from independent claim 17, and dependent claims 25 and 26, which depend from independent claim 23, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Maegawa in view of Fukiharu and further in view of Hoshi. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 17 and 23, neither Maegawa, Fukiharu, nor any combination of the two, describes or suggests the second light guiding plate claimed in claims 17 and 23.

Hoshi does not overcome the deficiencies of Maegawa and Fukiharu. In particular, Hoshi also does not describe or suggest the second light guiding plate. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19 and 20.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.